

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The Applicant has added a legend indicating "Prior Art" in Figure 1 for purposes of clarity. A replacement sheet including Figure 1 is attached.

REMARKS

SUMMARY

In the Office Action dated September 22, 2004, the drawings and specification were objected to because of minor informalities. Claims 6, 7, 9, 13, 14, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 31 and, 32 were also objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-23, 26-29, 32 and, 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Further, Claims 24, 25, 30, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Applicant have amended claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20-26, 28 and 30-32 to correct the minor informalities identified by the Examiner and other previously unidentified informalities presently identified by the Applicant. The amendments are not entered to overcome the prior art. No new matter has been introduced

Accordingly, Claims 1-33 remain currently pending.

IN THE DRAWINGS

The examiner has objected to the drawings because "Prior Art" did not appear in the legend for Figure 1. The applicants have submitted herewith replacement drawing sheet 1. In the replacement drawing sheet of Figure 1, the applicants have added "Prior Art" for purposes of clarity. No new matter has been added.

IN THE SPECIFICATION

The specification has been amended to improve the clarity of the disclosure. In particular, page 1, lines 13 and 15 have been amended to replace "number" with

"numbers" Additionally, page 7, line 13 has been amended to insert "to" between "refers" and "the." No new matter has been added.

IN THE CLAIMS

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-23, 26-29, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US patent No. 5,860,073 issued to Ferrel et al. ("Ferrel").

To establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Examiner must identify where "each and every facet of the claimed invention is disclosed in the applied reference." *Ex parte Levy*, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1462 (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. 1990), see also *Electro Med. Sys. S.A. v. Cooper Life Sciences*, 34 F.3d 1048, 1052, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1017, 1019 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claim 1

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Ferrel fails to anticipate at least one required operation of Claim 1. More specifically, Ferrel fails to anticipate any of the required operations of Claim 1, i.e. the required "defining (of) a master specification ...", "defining (of) a first subordinate content specification ... referencing ...", "defining (of) a second subordinate content specification ... referencing ...", and "generating said first and second resultant web pages ... in accordance with ...".

In Ferrel, a page is defined by a page layout specification. See e.g. Fig. 8, where "page 1 of the front page section" is defined by page layout 434, "page 1 of the business section" is defined by page layout 444, and "page 2 of the business section" is defined by page layout 446. In each case, the placement of the content is defined by

the placement of the content definition in the corresponding page layout. For examples, the placement of content object 460 in area 436 is defined by the placement of the picture control 436 in page layout 434, and the placement of story object 462 in area 438 is defined by the placement of the story control 438 in page layout 434. Page layout 434 does not reference any external specification for content placement, nor any other page layout. Thus, Ferrel fails to teach and anticipate the required limitations of “defining a ... content specification specifying ... content of a ... web page, referencing the master specification for ... content placement”.

Similarly, the navigation available to picture object 460 placed in area 436, story object 462 placed in area 438 ..., and so forth, are defined correspondingly by the picture control 436, story control 438 ... placed in page layout 434. Thus, page layout 434 does not reference any external specification for navigation, nor any other page layout. Thus, Ferrel fails to teach and anticipate the required limitations of “defining a ... content specification specifying ... content of a ... web page, referencing the master specification for ... navigation”.

As to style, Applicants agree that Ferrel teaches having the page layouts reference external style sheets for style properties governing the specified contents. For examples, the style for picture object 460 placed in area 436 is governed by style sheet 443 referenced by picture control 436 of page layout 434, the styles for story objects 470-474 placed in areas 452-456 are governed by either style sheet 457 or 459 referenced by story controls 448, 452-456 of page layouts 444 and 446, and so forth. However, as illustrated by Fig. 9 and its corresponding description, Ferrel’s style sheets are strictly concerned with style properties, such as paragraph properties, character

properties, and so forth. As discussed earlier, under Ferrel, navigation is given by the content control placed into a page layout, and the placement of the corresponding content is governed by the placement of the content control in the page layout, thus Ferrel does not reference an external specification for style, where the external specification also provides for navigation and content placement. Thus, Ferrel fails to teach and anticipate the required limitations of “defining a ... content specification specifying ... content of a ... web page, referencing the master specification for style, navigation and content placement”.

Given Ferrel failed to teach and anticipate the definition of content specifications for web page that references a master specification for style, navigation and content placement at the same time, it follows then, Ferrel also fails to teach and anticipate the required limitation of “defining a master specification specifying a common style, a common navigation arrangement, and common content placement ... content of a ... web page, referencing the master specification for each resultant web page to be generated” where the master specification is referenced by the subordinate web page specification specifying the web page.

It further follows then, Ferrel does not teach or anticipate the required limitation of “generating web pages” in accordance with “subordinate web page specifications” that reference a master specification for style, navigation and content placement. To the extent, common style, navigation and placement can be achieved under Ferrel, it is achieved via methodology that is different, and not anticipatory of the required limitations of claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Ferrel.

Claims 6, 16, 19, 22 and 28 all include in substance at least one of the above discussed limitations that Ferrel failed to teach. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 6, 16, 19, 22 and 28 are patentable over Ferrel.

Claims 2-5, 7-15, 17-18, 20-21, 23, 26-27, 29, 32 and 33 depend on either claim 1, 6, 16, 19, 22 and 29 correspondingly incorporating their limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 2-5, 7-15, 17-18, 20-21, 23, 26-27, 29, 32 and 33 are patentable over Ferrel.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 25 and 31

Claims 25 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2002/0052895, to Keating (“Keating”).

As described above, claims 22 and 28 are patentable over Ferrel. Keating does not remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of Ferrel, therefore Claims 22 and 28 are patentable over Ferrel, even when combined with Keating.

Claims 25 and 31 depend on independent Claims 22, and 28 respectively, incorporating their required elements. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, Claims 25 and 31 are patentable over Ferrel and Keating combined.

Claims 24 and 30

Claims 24 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel in view of *Lie et al.*, “Cascading Style Sheets, level 1” W3C Recommendation 17 Dec 1996, revision 11 Jan 1999 (www.w3.org/TR/CSS1) and (“Lie”). In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejections.

As described above, Claims 22 and 28 are patentable over Ferrel. Lie does not remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of Ferrel, therefore Claims 22 and 28 are patentable over Ferrel, even when combined with Lie.

Claims 25 and 31 depend on independent Claims 22 and 28 respectively, incorporating their required elements. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 25 and 31 are patentable over Ferrel and Lie combined.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. Claims 1-33 remain currently pending. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge shortages or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 500393. A Fee Transmittal is enclosed in duplicate for fee processing purposes.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: 12/15/04



Mark E. McClure
Registration No. 53,857

Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 206.407.1504